REMARKS

A notice of appeal has been filed. To narrow the issues for appeal to only the rejections under 35 USC 103(a), it is requested that the examiner consider the amendments made herein and the following argument, in order that the objections and rejections under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, may be withdrawn.

The title has been amended to make it more descriptive.

Claims 9 and 10 have been carefully reviewed, but no amendments have been made. The claims read as follows:

9. The computing process of claim 7 or 8 wherein the configuration on which the load-balancing determination is based changes dynamically and the load-balancing determination responds dynamically to such changes.

10. The computing process of claim 7 or 8 wherein the configuration on which the load-balancing determination is based is assumed to remain static after a load-balancing determination based on such configuration is made.

The examiner seems to believe that English grammar requires the changes proposed in the office action, but the claims are grammatically correct as they stand. The examiner's attention is drawn to the use of "on which" in claims 9 and 10. That usage makes it incorrect to add an additional "on" after "based".

Claims 1, 27, and 28 have been amended to address the minor matters raised by the examiner in the rejections under 35 USC 112, second paragraph.

The examiner has raised four questions, which we address below, using the examiner's paragraph numbers:

i. It is not the processes that are changed. What is changed is location at which the processes are run. The change may be based on a load-balancing determination, as noted in the claim. The workload at the client and at server are considered in determining whether to run the

parsing or layout processes at the client or at server. The examiner is referred to the body of the application for a more information.

ii. Claim 17 has been amended to delete "the operation" from the claim, as those words were redundant.

iii. Claim 27 has been amended to clarify what is meant by "process".

iv. Claim 29 seems clear as it stands. The "processes" in the claim is a reference back to the processes referred to in claim 1, and thus at least to the parsing and layout processes. As claim 1 makes clear these processes could run at either the server or client, and claim 29 is simply referring to those of the processes that are running at a particular time at the server. This could be either of the parsing or layout processes, for example.

Accordingly, because this amendment narrows the issues for appeal, the examiner is requested to enter the amendment and to withdraw all objections and rejections other than those based on 35 USC 103(a).

Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 9/9/65

G. Roger Lee
Reg. No. 28,963

Fish & Richardson P.C.
225 Franklin Street
Boston, MA 02110
Telephone: (617) 542-5070
Facsimile: (617) 542-8906

21163462